United Nations DP/2007/15/Corr.1

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund

Distr.: General
8 June 2007

Original: English

Annual session 2007
11 to 22 June 2007, New York
Item 1 of the provisional agenda
Organizational matters

Report of the first regular session 2007 (23 to 26 January 2007, New York)

Corrigendum

On page 8, paragraphs 37-40 *should read:*

37. In the ensuing discussions, the delegation of Canada called for continued monitoring of country programmes to ensure that UNDP remained meaningful, accountable and 'for the people' at the country level, continuing to focus on humanitarian and development needs and remain responsible for transparency and accountability in accordance with international standards.

38. The delegation of the Russian Federation opposed the manipulation and politicization of the operational activities and discussions of the Board, arguing that these undermined the work of UNDP.

39. The delegation of Japan reiterated that Member States are committed to abide by the Charter of the United Nations, adding that countries not complying with Security Council resolutions are in violation of their obligations and should not receive United Nations funds, particularly for programmes with strong economic and social development features aimed at supporting the government. Assistance to such countries should be of a humanitarian nature, and delivered directly to the people in need.

40. The delegation of Bangladesh (representing the Asia and the Pacific group of countries) and the delegation of Guatemala (representing Latin America and the Caribbean) cautioned against the Board's becoming partisan, and voiced strong support for a neutral, non-political forum. Cuba, as an observer delegation, asked why the Board was caught up in 'miserly interests' when there were pressing issues to address, such as achieving the MDGs and having more countries pledge 0.7 per cent of their gross domestic product to development activities. The delegation expressed concern about the potentially negative precedent being set by reopening

07-37428 (E)

the debate on the country programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

On page 8, paragraph 42 *should read:*

42. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea objected to reopening the discussion of its country programme. The delegation stated that the written suggestion by certain member states at the instigation of Japan and United States to reopen the discussion on the country programme document for the DPR Korea clearly constituted an attempt to politicize the international assistance for their own political purposes. The delegation reminded the Executive Board that the United States, timed with the beginning of the Board session, had been actively mobilizing its mass media to distort UNDP activities in the DPR Korea, with a view to damaging the image of UNDP and the DPR Korea. The delegation said that it rejected categorically the distorted and fabricated allegations made by the United States through its media. The delegation reiterated that the country programme document had been formulated on the basis of the United Nations Strategic Framework through the Government-United Nations consultations, and that it had been positively considered by the Board at its second regular session 2006. The delegation made clear its position that it would reject any assistance with political conditions irrespective of its quantity and content, and stressed that the process of direct recruitment of national staff should not lead to any disturbance in the implementation of project activities. Finally, the delegation agreed to the measures introduced by UNDP, even though it was not satisfied with them, as a way to resolve the situation and avoid setting a negative precedent.

On page 20, the last sentence of paragraph 106, starting from line 16, *should be replaced with the following:*

106. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea emphasized that monitoring and evaluation were important processes of the country programme implementation. The delegation underscored that it did not see any reason for the delegations of Japan and the United States of America to raise issues such as monitoring and evaluation, because supplies were provided to the project sites and beneficiaries and regular monitoring visits to project sites had been undertaken in compliance with UNFPA regulations.